

## AWARD

This reference No. 187 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/54-80/14232, dated 19th March, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Raj Deo workman and the management of M/s Springs India Ltd., 38-A, Industrial Area, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Raj Deo was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties and both the parties appeared before this court through their authorised representatives. On 6th June, 1980 the representative of the management filed a copy of settlement dated 4th June, 1980 which is Exhibit M-1. According to this settlement, the workman had received a sum of Rs. 500 (Rs. five hundred only) in full and final settlement of his all claims including the right of his re-instatement or re-employment with the respondent Company. This settlement was duly agreed to by the representative of the workman that the documents filed by the management was correct and there was no dispute left between the parties.

In view of the above statement of both the parties, I give my award accordingly and hold that there is no dispute remains to be adjudicated between the parties. No order as to costs. So this award is in answer of this reference.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Dated the 16th June, 1980.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 994, dated 16th June, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8246.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 179/80

between

SHRI RAJINDER, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BRAKE LINING  
LIMITED, 66-A, NIT, FARIDABAD

Present:

None for the workman.

Shri A. S. Ghadha and Shri Rajesh Sharma, for the management.

## AWARD

This reference No. 179 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/38-80/13646, dated 14th March, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Rajinder, workman and the management of M/s Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, NIT, Faridabad. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Rajinder was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. On 4th June, 1980 the case was called at 8.30 a.m. but none was present on behalf of the workman and I kept waiting for some time for the presence of the workman. Now the case was called again at 9.30 a.m. by this time also none appeared for the workman. I had to proceed *ex parte* against the workman and the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the management for 10th June, 1980.

On 10th June, 1980 the *ex parte* evidence of the management was recorded. The management produced Shri Ram Chand Khattar, Time Office Incharge of the respondent company its sole witness. He stated on oath that the concerned workman had tendered his resignation voluntarily which was duly accepted by the management which is Exhibit M-1. He further stated that the workman had duly taken or received full and final payment of his outstanding dues. He executed the receipt voucher of this amount which is Exhibit M-2 which were placed on the file.

In view of the unrebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absention of the workman in the proceedings in this Court of this reference. I feel that the workman has settled his dispute with the respondent management, and it is held that the reference is bad, as no claim is made out of the workman against the management. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer to this reference.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Dated the 16th June, 1980

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 993, dated 20th June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8248.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. M. G. Shahani (Delhi) (P) Limited, 12/1, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 23 of 1980

between

SHRIMATI KASTURI DEVI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S M. G. SHAHANI (DELHI) (P) LTD., 12/1, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present:

Smt. Kasturi Devi, workman in person along with Shri K. L. Sharma.

Shri R. N. Rai for the management.

#### AWARD

This reference No. 23 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/237-79/1496, dated 10th January, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shrimati Kasturi Devi workman and management of M/s M. G. Shahani (Delhi) (P) Ltd., 12/1, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The term of reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shrimati Kasturi Devi was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is she entitled ?”

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties and both the parties appeared before this Court through their authorised representatives. The management has filed a written statement on 20th February, 1980. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by me on 26th March, 1980.

- (1) Whether a fair and proper enquiry has been held and conducted by the management before his dismissal? If so, to what effect? OPM
- (2) Whether the dismissal was not justified and it was in order? If so, to what effect? OPW
- (3) Relief.

No other issue pressed or prayed for. On 6th June, 1980, the workman Shrimati Kasturi Devi made a statement in this court that she has received a sum of Rs. 3,600 (Rs. Three thousand and six hundred only) in full and final settlement of her all claims including the right of her re-instatement or re-employment with the respondent Company. She further stated that now there is no dispute left with the respondent-management.

I thus relying on the statement of Shrimati Kasturi Devi, workman, hold that the demand raised by the workman against the management leading to this reference has been duly satisfied. There is now no dispute remains to be adjudicated between the parties, therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. So this award is in answer of this reference.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Dated the 16th June, 1980.

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 991, dated the 20th June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary [to Government, of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8249.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, N.I.T., Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI I. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 170 of 1980

*between*

SHRI REWATI PARSAD, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BRAKE  
LINING LIMITED, 66-A, N.I.T., FARIDABAD

*Present.—*

None for the workman.

Shri A. S. Chadha and Shri Rajesh Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 170 of 1980 has been referred to this Court, by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/33-80/13700, dated 14th March, 1980, under section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Rewati Parsad,

workman and the management of M/s. Brake Lining Limited, 66-A, N.I.T., Faridabad. The term of the reference was :

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Rewati Parsad was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. On 4th June, 1980, the case was called at 8.30 A.M. but none was present on behalf of the workman and kept waiting for some time for the presence of the workman. Now the case was called again at 9.30 a. m. by this time also none appeared for the workman. I had to proceed *ex parte* against the workman and the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the management for 10th June, 1980.

On 10th June, 1980, the *ex parte* evidence of the management was recorded. The management produced Shri Ram Chand Khattar, Time Office Incharge of the respondent Company its sole witness. He stated on oath that the concerned workman has tendered his resignation voluntarily which was duly accepted by the management which is Ex. M-1. He further stated that the workman has duly taken or received in full and final payment of his outstanding dues. He executed the receipt voucher of this amount is Ex. M-2 which were placed on the file.

In view of the un-rebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absention of the workman in proceedings in this court of this reference. I feel that the workman has settled his dispute with the respondent-management and it is held that the reference is bad, as no claim is made out of the workman against the management. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Dated the 16th June, 1980

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 990, dated 20th June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 30th June, 1980

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8288.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Santosh and Associates, 1E/35, NIT, Faridabad. :—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 302 of 1979

between

SHRI RAM SAJIWAN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SANTOSH  
AND ASSOCIATES 1E/35, N.I.T., FARIDABAD.

Present :

Shri C. L. Oberoi, for the workman.

Shri D. C. Bhardwaj, for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. 39-79/41964, dated 24th September, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Santosh and Associates 1E/35, N.I.T.,

Faridabad and its workman Shri Ram Sajiwan, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Sajiwan was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filled their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 8th February, 1980 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The representative for the management made a statement that the workman had received his payment on 9th July, 1979, and he was not interested in pursuing the reference. He also stated that the representative for the workman had no authority to appear on behalf of the workman. So much so the statement of claim and rejoinder were also not signed by the workman himself but by the representative "without any authority". The representative for the workman was therefore, called upon to produce the workman as well his letter of authority. On the date fixed he stated that the workman was not interested in pursuing the case and he has no objection to the settlement filed by the management. I, therefore, give my award that the workman has settled his dispute with the management and there remains nothing for adjudication.

Dated 18th June, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 582, dated 21st June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8289.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s The Ballabgarh Primary Co-operative Land Development Bank, Ltd., Ballabgarh:—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 67 of 1978

*between*

SHRI GOPAL SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S THE BALLABGARH  
PRIMARY CO-OPERATIVE LAND DEVELOPMENT BANK LIMITED, BALLABGARH

Present :

Shri S. R. Gupta, for the workman.

Shri H. R. Dua, for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. ID/FD/610-77/8953, dated 27th February, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s The Ballabgarh Primary Co-operative Land Development Bank Limited, Ballabgarh and its workman Shri Gopal Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Gopal Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filled their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 3rd June, 1978 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management took many opportunities for their evidence but did not produce any. Finally the case of the management was closed by order. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman did not produce any evidence despite four opportunities.

On the next date of hearing, the representative for the management withdrew from the proceedings and the workman was called upon to adduce *ex-parte* evidence but he could not. The adjournment was therefore, given. On the last date of hearing the representative for the workman stated that the workman was called for the date fixed but he did not come. Therefore, the case was closed for the evidence of the workman also. In the absence of evidence of the parties, I give my award that there is no dispute between the parties.

Dated 18th June, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 581, dated 21st June, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8290.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act, No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Delhi Pinjra Poll Society Regd. Gaushala Chhainsa, Ballabgarh:—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 164 of 1978

Between

SHRI KUNDAN LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DELHI PINJRA  
POLL SOCIETY REGD., GAUSHALA CHHAINSA, BALLABGARH.

Present—

Shri Bhim Singh Yadav, for the workman.

Shri H. R. Dua, for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. ID/FD/9-M-78/26629, dated 22nd June, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Delhi Pinjra Poll Society Regd., Gaushala Chhainsa, Ballabgarh and its workman Shri Kundan Lal, to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Kundan Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 16th January, 1979:—

(1) Whether the workman resigned his job of his own?

(2) If Issue No. 1 is not proved in favour of the management whether termination of services of the workman was justified and in order?

(3) If not, to what relief is he entitled?

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri N. P. Singh, their General Manager as MW-1 and closed their case. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. The workman examined himself as WW-1 and closed his case. Then the case was fixed for arguments. Arguments were heard. I now give my findings issueswise:—

Issue No 1 : —MW=1 stated that Shri Kundan Lal, the concerned workman, was a Chowkidar on the farm of the management. He started getting illegal possession of some person done on

the farm and then he lodged a complaint against the management and the police station. On the complaint being found baseless the workman resigned his job and gave in writing Ex. MW-1 and MW-2. In cross-examination he stated that the workman joined service in 1977. He stated in cross-examination that letter Exhibit W-3 was issued in reply to the resignation of the workman. He also admitted that there is no acceptance by the management on Ex. MW-1 and MW-2.

3. The workman stated that he had joined services on 7th July, 1977, and was drawing wages at the rate of Rs. 400 p. m. No charge-sheet was given to him. The management obtained his signatures on a blank paper for preparing some outstanding lost bills. In cross-examination he stated that he did not lodge any complaint to any authority regarding his outstanding wages. He also stated that he had given only one bill. He denied the suggestion that he had resigned his job. I have gone through the claim statement where there is no mention of resignation or signing of blank paper by the workman. He only stated that his wages for some previous months were outstanding. This fact is again missing in his demand notice. I have perused Ex. MW-1 and MW-2. These are dated 12th January, 1978. Ex. MW-1 shows the admission by the workman of the resignation submitted by him. It also shows that he withdraws his complaint against the Manager of the Management lodged in Police Station Chinsai. Ex. MW 2 shows a letter addressed to the SHO Police Station withdrawing complaint lodged by the workman. The representative for the workman laid great emphasis on the language of MW-1 stating that it was not language of resignation and also on date of W-3 which was shown as 10th January, 1977. By this letter the workman was called to Delhi office. I find that the language of MW-1 is in the form of a letter mentioning the resignation submitted by the workman of his own. It makes no difference of the language of letter of resignation. The facture of the same stands proved. As regards the date on Ex. W-3, I presume that the year 1977 was inadvertently written for 1978. Because the date is 10th January and such mistakes do happen in the first month of the year where figure of the previous year is written by mistake. Therefore, this issue is decided in favour of the management.

*Issue No. 2.—*

On the proof of issue No. 1 in favour of the management, this issue has become redundant. Therefore, no discussion is necessary.

*Issue No. 3.—*

The workman is not entitled to any relief.

4. While answering the reference, I give my award that the workman resigned his job of his and his services were not terminated. The workman is not entitled to any relief. I order accordingly.

Dated 17th June, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal,  
Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 580, dated 21st June, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal,  
Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8291.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Anil Rubber Mills, Sector-6, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 321 of 1978

*between*

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. ANIL RUBBER MILLS,  
SECTOR-6, FARIDABAD

*Present :—*

Shri P. K. De, for the workmen.

Shri H. R. Dua, for the management.

## AWARD

1. By order No. ID/FD/49-78/36485, dated 3rd August, 1978, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following disputes between the management of M/s. Anil Rubber Mills, Sector-6, Faridabad, and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

1. Whether grades and scales of all the workmen be framed ? If so, with what details ?
2. Whether the workmen are entitled to house rent allowance ? If so, with what details ?
3. Whether the workmen are entitled to grant of bonus for the year 1976-77 at higher rate than declared by the management ? If so, with what details ?
4. Whether all the employees should be supplied with uniforms and shoes ? If so, with what details ?
5. Whether production bonus be given to all workmen ? If so, with what details ?
6. Whether the minimum wages should be fixed at Rs 350 ? If so, with what details ?
7. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of night allowance ? If so, with what details ?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties issues were framed on 6th March, 1979 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workmen. Many opportunities were given to the workmen for leading their evidence. On the last date of hearing, evidence of the workman was not present, and their representative withdrew from the proceedings. In the circumstances, the case was dismissed in default. I, therefore, give my award that there is no dispute between the parties at present.

Dated 17th June, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 579, dated 21st June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/8292.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. R.R. Industries, Engineers and Manufacturers, Sector-24, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 118 of 1979

between

SHRI LALLAN WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. R. R. INDUSTRIES,  
ENGINEERS AND MANUFACTURERS, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri P. K. De, for the workman.

Shri R. N. Rai, for the management.

## AWARD

1. By order No. 11/16-79/14823, dated 30th March, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. R. R. Industries, Engineers and Manufacturer, Sector-24, Faridabad and its workman Shri Lallan, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the dismissal of Shri Lallan was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?



On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 22nd June, 1979 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined Shri R.N. Rai as MW-1 and closed their case. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman. On the last date of hearing the representative for the management made a statement that a settlement has been arrived at with the workman. He produced joint application Ex. M-1 and settlement Ex. M-2. The representative for the workman endorsed the statement of the representative for the management. In these circumstances, I give my award that the dispute has been settled mutually between the parties and there is nothing left for adjudication.

Dated 17th June, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.  
No. 569, dated 20th June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated 17th June, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11 (112)-80-3Lab/8294.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Suraj Lamps and Industries (P) Ltd., Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 552 of 1978

*between*

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SURAJ LAMPS AND  
INDUSTRIES (P) LTD., FARIDABAD

*Present.—*

Shri P. K. De, for the workmen.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

#### AWARD

1. By order No. ID/FD/11/161/78/52393, dated 23rd November, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Suraj Lamps and Industries (P) Ltd., Faridabad and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of wages for the lay off period from 1st June, 1978 to 24th June, 1978? If so, with what details

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 9th July, 1979 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workmen. Even after many opportunities, the workmen did not adduce any evidence. On the last date of hearing, the representative for the workmen stated that no evidence was coming forth even after his repeated calls made to the workmen. In these circumstances, the case of the workmen was closed. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. But the representative for the management made a statement that he did not want to adduce any evidence. In the absence of evidence of the workmen I decide all the issues against the workmen. I, therefore, give my award that the workmen are not entitled to any relief.

Dated 17th June, 1980

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 570, dated 20th June, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.